



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

latter's own threshold was named Arnaeus by his mother, but all the young men called him Irus because he carried messages (Iris was the heavenly messenger): the poet refers to him as Irus, never as Arnaeus (Odyssey 18.5 ff., 75, 96, and five or six times more in the same book). At Troy itself Hector's little son, whose given name was Scamandrius, was called Astyanax by all except his father, 'for Hector alone preserved Ilios'.

It seems more natural, therefore, to assume that Alexander was the name which the Trojans themselves applied to their champion and which to a considerable extent had displaced his given name, than that it was the Greek equivalent of Paris. The Iliad gives no hint of a diversity of language between Trojan and Greek which might have justified such a translation. Furthermore, the name 'Defender' (Alexandros) would be more appropriate for a recognized champion than for a prince at his birth.

Still another explanation of the alternative name of Paris is possible. Mr. D. D. Luckenbill (Classical Philology 6.85 f.) queries whether Greek Alexandros is not the equivalent of Mitannian Alakshandu. If Alakshandu, king of Arzawa (about 1300 B.C.), was an early Alexander, then it is conceivable that the crown prince of Troy may have been called Alexander at his birth, and that Paris is the appellative.

Neither of the above suggestions weakens Professor Scott's theory about Hector, which is to be regarded as one of the most useful contributions in the way of a hypothesis based on strong evidence which this generation has made to the appreciation of the creative genius of Homer.

UNIVERSITY OF VERMONT.

SAMUEL E. BASSETT.

REVIEWS

A Short History of Rome. By Guglielmo Ferrero and Corrado Barbagallo. Translated from the Italian by George Chrystal. Volume I, The Monarchy and the Republic (754 B.C.-44 B.C.); Volume II, The Empire (44 B.C.-476 A.D.). New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons (1918, 1919). Pp. VII + 510; V + 516.

About half of Volume I of this new History of Rome and the first part of Volume II form practically an epitome, with some rearrangement of material but with negligible changes in points of fact, of Ferrero's well known work, Greatness and Decline of Rome. Even the phraseology of the earlier work has here and there been preserved, particularly in the case of striking, epigrammatic remarks. Here is one illustration. The new work states (1.474): "He had been made prisoner by his own victory"; in the earlier work, with reference to the same situation, we read (2.305): "He was the prisoner of his own victory".

In the Preface the authors make the following statement:

Our chief aim has been to bring out clearly the connection of these larger events.

Now, generally speaking, the work successfully carries out this purpose; but at times the effort to keep together events occurring at the same time leads to an effect almost choppy. Pages 371-377 of Volume I present this order of events: Lucullus in the East; Spartacus's rebellion; Lucullus in the East, and Pompey in Spain; Crassus against Spartacus; The election of Pompey and Crassus; Lucullus in the East; the consulship of Pompey and Crassus; Lucullus in the East. Other examples can be readily found.

The period of the Julian and the Claudian Emperors receives fairly full treatment in Volume II, as is to be expected where Tacitus is available as a source. The period deserves detailed study; but perhaps the court intrigues centering in Messalina, Agrippina, Poppaea Sabina could be adequately narrated in smaller space, with the result that room would be left for more important matters of the development of government and civilization. Ferrero, while criticising Tacitus, has himself fallen under his spell. It is very natural that this should happen: Ferrero is a modern Tacitus, brilliant, epigrammatic, with a very real interest in moral and social conditions, in personalities, and with the ability to make the most of a dramatic situation.

In the latter half of Volume II a great many details, particularly in the history of the years of anarchy in the third century A.D., are treated in a very small compass, with any number of dates. One gets the impression of an attempt to include everything, though there is not space for it all. A more general treatment of this period, with the omission of matters not significant, might make for better reading.

A real blot on the work is the attitude assumed toward German scholarship in historical research. The authors indulge in many flings at "the critics", more in the first volume than in the second, and usually, as might be expected, they make their statements general, without references to definite works. A good example of the attitude is found in 1.5:

During the nineteenth century there flourished in the universities of Germany a historical school which, by the Germanization of a Greek word, termed itself "critical". The besetting sin of this school is its determination to extract at all costs from the abysses of the past historical data which are hopelessly lost.

Of course this prejudiced attitude is due to feelings aroused by the Great War; but, in spite of its emphasis, it does not prevent the authors from referring frequently to German scholars as authorities. It so happens, by ill chance, that on the same page there follows an example of their own critical acumen:

The ancient Romans, being nearer in time to that event, were in a better position than we to know when their city was founded.

With regard to statements of fact presented and theories advanced, this review will generally be confined to those parts of the work in which new material, not already published in Ferrero's earlier works and often reviewed, appears.

The authors advance at some length, without accepting it, the theory that Rome was founded by the Etruscans:

The Etruscans were better fitted than the Latins of the eighth century B.C., to establish a flourishing emporium on the banks of the Tiber.

However, they do not feel the proof strong enough, and so are on the fence between the theory of a Latin origin and that of an Etruscan origin. On the authority of Dionysius of Halicarnassus, they are willing to believe that under Tarquin Rome actually became, by conquest, the capital of Etruria and that hence came the Etruscan influence on Roman civilization in the regal period. Such a description of affairs may be true, but who can prove it? It is better with Heitland, for example, to be very cautious in handling the details of the origins of Rome.

Hand in hand with this theory of early power is the idea, which is made prominent, that Rome in the regal period was a really great commercial and industrial city, and a "power at sea", in fact one of the leading cities of the Mediterranean. The chief proofs advanced in support of this theory are the record of the founding of Ostia, the port, in this period, the large size of the early city, as indicated by Servius's wall (which, however, scholars do not by any means all attribute to the regal period), and the "improvements in the low-lying parts of the city", of which the Cloaca Maxima is visible evidence. The apparent weakness and insignificance of Rome in the early Republic are then treated as a decided set-back at the time of the eviction of the kings. That Rome was weaker for a time after the regal period seems true, but for such an exaggeration of her early powers there is little good evidence. Later, the authors themselves state that Rome "was not a commercial power" even at the beginning of the Punic Wars, 250 years afterward, but that at this time was made "the second effort of Rome to become" one.

The *concilium plebis* is merged, in this history, into the *comitia tributa*, and as an assembly of the plebs only; but no reasons are given for ruling the *concilium plebis* out of existence.

In discussing the Second Punic War the authors advance the theory that Saguntum was "the occasion . . . the real cause . . . was the conquest of Cisalpine Gaul by Rome". Carthage was humiliated by Rome's extension of her sway, while she herself was forbidden to cross the Ebro. It seems to the reviewer that such a conception of the situation enlarges entirely too much the sphere of Carthage's vital interests. This is not to deny that Hannibal had knowledge of conditions in Northern Italy, and that his route to Italy is a proof that he meant to make the most of them.

After the Second Punic War, when Rome might have been expected to exploit her powers to the utmost, "a sudden change came over Roman policy", which resulted in "an aversion to territorial aggrandizement". The facts, of course, are known; but Rome's expansion at the time of the conquest of Carthage may not have

been due to imperialistic plans, but to a feeling that to keep Carthage out Rome must be in—a defensive policy. There would then be no need of explaining a great change of policy. Rome had been, and still was, conservative.

Differing from his early work, Ferrero now explains "the Jugurthine scandal" by his interpretation of the political situation at Rome, and not by the theory of bribery. The scandalous stories in Sallust originated among the democrats, who were violently opposed to the senatorial party. Proof of the new idea is lacking.

In the study of "the Augustan Republic" there is a general agreement with the larger work, and further an insistent claim that before Dio Cassius no writer "appears to suspect that Augustus had hidden a monarchy under the old republican forms". But the authors can not support their views by such statements. Tacitus (Annals 1.3, 9) had precisely the idea of a monarchy concealed.

As a part of the new constitution of Augustus one might expect a discussion of the reorganization of the *curtus honorum*, and its importance for the Empire. But nothing appears. And there is no apparent use made, as a basis of a study of military organization, of such a work as Domaszewski's Rangordnung.

Proper recognition is given to the fact that Tiberius's policy was to have the Senate take an active part in governing; but again there is overemphasis in stating that "he wished to reconstitute the ancient power of the aristocracy". It seems to the reviewer that the transference of the elections to the Senate was merely a necessary development, but might well be construed as a plan to add to the powers of the *princeps* rather than to those of the Senate.

Vespasian carried through a "renovation of the senate by the addition of elements drawn from the Romanized provinces of the West". This act of the Emperor is properly stressed as adding real elements of strength to the Senate; but that these elements gave rise to hatred and opposition to Domitian, as this work would have it, and to his final overthrow, can not be proved, and that a "Republican Renaissance" began under Trajan, from this influence, is far from certain. It remains to be proved that in the second century the Senate gained any power, and that the Emperor was merely *primus inter pares*. This view is, as the Preface indicates, due to Ferrero alone, and is stressed by such statements as this: "At the end of 104 the senate was again faced with the necessity of sending an expedition" against Dacia. In criticism of this theory it should be noticed that several of Pliny's letters give us clear insight into the attitude of Senators toward the Emperor. He is plainly their ruler, gracious, kindly, even friendly, but their ruler, and they feel his superiority. And is not the growth of bureaucracy in this period an evidence of an increasing tendency to centralize government in the hands of the *princeps*? Were not the friendly relations between Senate and Emperor in this "era of good feeling" due to a frank recognition by the Senate of its own

and the Emperor's actual positions, a condition promoted by the dying-out of old aristocratic traditions and the growth of new influences, partially at least as a result of Vespasian's reformation? Did not the personal character of the 'good' Emperors contribute to this condition?

At least two letters reported in the *Scriptores Historiae Augustae*, one of Hadrian, another of Avidius Cassius, are accepted as genuine documents with no proofs, or references to proofs, given.

Caracalla "apparently excluded senators from all military command", according to this history. It would be difficult to prove it (see C. W. Keyes, *The Rise of the Equites*, and S. E. Stout, *Governors of Moesia*, 37, 64).

Again an instance of overemphasis is found in this statement:

When Diocletian donned the purple the Graeco-Roman empire of Trajan and of Hadrian was already almost entirely transformed into an Asiatico-barbarian empire.

The meaning is that civilization had so changed, not merely the form of government. Is it not more nearly correct to say that the Graeco-Roman civilization, though significantly affected by the Orient, still lived on?

Little need be said of the form and the style of this new history. As is usual in Ferrero's publications, the reading is generally very easy and highly interesting, though 'journalistic'. The expression, "New and unexpected developments" frequently occurs, and the combination "new and tremendous disaster" appears not seldom. But there is more to the work than merely interesting writing. New points of view are offered to the reader, and proper emphasis is placed on matters sometimes neglected. As illustrations may be noted the treatment, in Volume I, of "progress" over against "corruption", and the emphasis on economic change and class struggles. In the period of the Empire, the survey of the provinces, given in connection with the account of the reign of Hadrian, the development of law, matters of taxation, the effects of debasing the coinage, and in particular the struggles and changes in the later Empire due to the rise of Christianity are all presented in an interesting and helpful way.

To conclude this part of the review, we may say that the work seems to have too much originality in its treatment of the origins of Rome, to be rather inadequate in the history of the first century A.D., due probably to too much dependence on Tacitus (one must use Tacitus, but must be able to get away from him also), and to present too many details in portions of the later history. In general it is the sort of work that the reviewer should like to assign for reading, rather than to make the sole text-book of a course.

The work of translation has been very satisfactorily done, and the printing is clear; but there are neither maps nor illustrations. A good-sized Index concludes each volume.

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA.

G. A. HARRER.

Latin Poetry from Catullus to Claudian. An Easy Reader. Edited by C. E. Freeman. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press (1919). Pp. vi + 176.

The editor states in his Preface that the volume "is mainly intended for those who have some knowledge of Virgil and Ovid, but who have not at present much opportunity for more general reading". His object has been "to choose passages which are easy as well as beautiful", his brief notes are "only meant to save time spent in referring to other books", he "set out with a determination to make them short", and regrets only that he has "not succeeded in making them shorter than they are". There are seven selections from Catullus, nine from Vergil, ten from Horace, seven from Tibullus, six from Propertius, eight from Ovid, five from Lucan, seven from Statius, and three from Claudian. A brief notice on the author precedes each group of selections. There are also a vocabulary and an index of proper names.

The reviewer finds himself interested in this little volume not only as a miniature anthology for the casual reading of the graduate humanist, well suited as it may be to that purpose, but also as a possible text-book for College classes. He has just finished reading very pleasurably, with a class of Sophomores, Professor Durham's handy little edition of Plautus's *Amphitruo* (Allyn and Bacon), which is annotated after much the same fashion, except that its brief commentary appears, for convenience's sake, at the foot of the page. It was his observation that the brevity of the notes tended to concentrate attention on the text, that the frequent translations of unusual phrases, subject to explanation *ex cathedra*, made possible a desirable rate of speed in translation, and that their freedom from labored erudition did not prevent the *cathedra* from becoming erudite when occasion warranted.

Of course this raises the whole question of the end and function of classical Readers, and the reviewer would not be misinterpreted as belittling the efforts of more laborious editors, many of whose so-called College texts seem to him nevertheless to be designed rather for the instructor than for the class. Professor Shorey, in the Preface to his edition of Horace, alludes amusingly and truly to "the young student in haste" and to "the critical and grammatical discussions found in all school editions which he always skips". Not unnaturally. The Freshmen and the Sophomores who read Horace and Plautus under my guidance average eighteen recitation hours per week. Figure for each the old-fashioned two hours of preparation and you get something in advance of the eight hour day, including Saturdays. And after that, speaking preceptorially, before that, following *studiosus*, who after all decides the matter, the 'extra-curricular activities'! Forsooth, *dum loquimur, fugerit invida aetas!*

A partial solution, obviously, is to carry Latin into the field of extra-curricular activity. The same class that read with me Professor Durham's *Amphitruo*, minus much erudition, had just finished the Andria, and a group of them took the trouble to 'put it on', in English